



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,599	01/30/2002	Bjorn Markus Jakobsson	47-2	8291

7590 12/28/2005

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

EXAMINER

FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/060,599	JAKOBSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Courtney D. Fields	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending.
2. Claims 1,8, and 14 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 13 October 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Referring to the rejection of claim 1, the Applicant argues and contends that the prior art (Rabin et al.) does not a technique for tracing the source of a computer generated document. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., tracing the source of a computer generated document) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
3. Referring to the rejection of claims 1,8, and 14, the Applicant argues and contends that the prior art (Rabin et al.) does not teach nor disclose identifying a computer generated document by an independent, unaffiliated third party having no connection with the generation/sourcing of the document. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that Rabin et al. discloses an identification tag which was created and stored within a tag table. The identification tag discloses unique identifier value ID associated with the user device. The identification tag identifier value ID cannot be

Art Unit: 2137

established or revealed to a third party. Rabin et al. also discloses privacy for preserving purchases using an identification tag. The identity during the purchase of software and during the use of software can never be revealed to a third party. (See Column 19, lines 62-67- Column 20, lines 1-20)

4. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-20 are maintained in view of the reasons below and in view of the reasons below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rabin et al. (US Patent No. 6,889,209).

Referring to the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 14, Rabin et al. discloses a method and system for operation of a computer system for identification tagging a document created by the computer system comprising the steps of:

calculating a function of the document (See Column 3, lines 63-67, Column 4, lines 1-4)

creating an identification tag by performing a cryptographic function on the function of the document and a unique processor identifier associated with the computer

system, the cryptographic function producing an identification tag having the characteristics that a third party possessing the document, the identification tag, and a plurality of unique processor identifiers, can determine the computer system which created the document and attaching the identification tag to the document (See Column 4, lines 40-54, Column 6, lines 25-61)

Referring to the rejection of claims 2,9, and 15, Rabin et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the function of the document is a hash function (See Column 4, lines 55-61)

Referring to the rejection of claims 3,10, and 16, Rabin et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the relationship between a unique processor identifier and its associated unique processor associator is one of equality (See Column 7, lines 51-64, Column 13, lines 42-65)

Referring to the rejection of claims 4,11, and 17, Rabin et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the cryptographic function is a Message Authentication Code (See Column 32, lines 54-64)

Referring to the rejection of claims 5,12, and 18, Rabin et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the relationship between a unique processor identifier and its associated unique processor associator is that the unique processor identifier is a function of its associated processor associator (See Column 26, lines 1-14)

Referring to the rejection of claims 6,13, and 19, Rabin et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the cryptographic function is based on modular exponentiation (See Column 30, lines 40-50)

Referring to the rejection of claims 7 and 20, Rabin et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the unique processor identifier is stored in a processor of the computer system (See Column 12, lines 64-67, Column 13, lines 1-13)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cdf
cdf

December 22, 2005

E. L. Moise
EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER